

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No. 7034/2021

Date of Institution ... 05.07.2021

Date of Decision ... 19.01.2022

Muhammad Zabir, Ex-Constable, No. 1993, District Orakzai.

... (Appellant)

VERSUS

The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and others.

... (Respondents)

Taimur Ali Khan,
Advocate

... For Appellant

Muhammad Adeel Butt,
Additional Advocate General

... For respondents

AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN
ATIQU-UR-REHMAN WAZIR

...
...

CHAIRMAN
MEMBER (EXECUTIVE)

JUDGMENT

ATIQU-UR-REHMAN WAZIR MEMBER (E):-

Brief facts of the

case are that the appellant, while serving as Constable in Police Department was proceeded against on the charges of his involvement in FIR U/Ss 302/324/427/34PPC Dated 15-05-2020 and was ultimately dismissed from service vide order dated 28-12-2020. In the meanwhile, the appellant was acquitted of the criminal charges by the competent court of law vide judgment dated 20-01-2021. After release from jail, the appellant filed departmental appeal dated 26-01-2021, which was accepted vide order dated 12-03-2020 and formal inquiry was ordered and on recommendation of inquiry officer, departmental appeal of the appellant was rejected vide order dated 21-06-2021, hence the instant service appeal with prayers that the impugned orders dated 28-12-2020 and 21-06-2021

may be set aside and the appellant may be re-instated in service with all back benefits.

02. Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that the impugned orders are against law, facts and norms of natural justice, therefore not tenable and liable to be set aside; that the inquiry so conducted against the appellant would reveal that the appellant was exonerated of the charges but the competent authority ordered for another inquiry without recording any reason, which is against the norms of justice and fair play; that in the second inquiry the appellant was not associated with proceedings of the inquiry as the appellant at that particular time was in jail, hence no charge sheet/statement of allegation was served upon the appellant, nor any showcause was served upon the appellant, thus deprived the appellant to defend his cause in a proper way; that the appellant was falsely implicated in a criminal case and as per rule, the appellant was required to be suspended from service and to wait for conclusion of the criminal case but the respondents hastily proceeded the appellant and dismissed from service illegally; that the appellant has been acquitted of the criminal charges, hence there remains no ground to maintain such penalty anymore.

03. Learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents has contended that upon his involvement in a criminal case, FIR U/Ss 302/324/427/34PPC Dated 15-05-2020 and the appellant was proceeded departmentally on the same charges; regular inquiry was conducted against the appellant, but the competent authority, while disagreeing with recommendation of the inquiry officer, ordered for another inquiry and as per recommendation of the inquiry officer, the appellant was removed from service vide order dated 28-12-2020; that though the appellant was acquitted of the criminal charges, but it is a well settled legal proposition that departmental and criminal proceedings can run side by side and the appellant was held guilty in the departmental proceedings, hence was awarded with appropriate punishment.

04. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record.

05. Record reveals that the appellant being involved in case FIR U/Ss 302/324/427/34PPC Dated 15-05-2020, was proceeded departmentally in absentia as the appellant was in jail and was released after acquittal from the criminal charges vide judgment dated 20-01-2021, but before his release from jail, the appellant was dismissed on 28-12-2020, hence the appellant in the first place was not afforded opportunity of defense, as the appellant was not associated with proceedings of the departmental inquiry, as he was proceeded against in absentia. To this effect, the august Supreme Court of Pakistan in its judgment reported as 2008 SCMR 1369 has held that in case of imposing major penalty, the principles of natural justice required that a regular inquiry was to be conducted in the matter, otherwise civil servant would be condemned unheard and major penalty of dismissal from service would be imposed upon him without adopting the required mandatory procedure, resulting in manifest injustice.

06. Being involved in a criminal case, the respondents were required to suspend the appellant from service under section 16:19 of Police Rules, 1934, which specifically provides for cases of the nature. Provisions of Civil Service Regulations-194-A also supports the same stance, hence the respondents were required to wait for the conclusion of the criminal case, but the respondents hastily initiated departmental proceedings against the appellant and dismissed him from service before conclusion of the criminal case. It is a settled law that dismissal of civil servant from service due to pendency of criminal case against him would be bad unless such official was found guilty by competent court of law. Contents of FIR would remain unsubstantiated allegations, and based on the same, maximum penalty could not be imposed upon a civil servant. Reliance is placed on PLJ 2015 Tr.C. (Services) 197, PLJ 2015 Tr.C. (Services) 208 and PLJ 2015 Tr.C. (Services) 152.


07. The criminal case was decided vide judgment dated 20-01-2021 and the appellant was exonerated of the charges. In a situation, if a civil servant is dismissed from service on account of his involvement in criminal case, then he would have been well within his right to claim re-instatement in service after acquittal from that case. Reliance is placed on 2017 PLC (CS) 1076. In 2012 PLC (CS) 502, it has been held that if a person is acquitted of a charge, the presumption would be that he was innocent. Moreover, after acquittal of the appellant in the criminal case, there was no material available with the authorities to take action and impose major penalty. Reliance is placed on 2003 SCMR 207 and 2002 SCMR 57, 1993 PLC (CS) 460. It is a well-settled legal proposition that criminal and departmental proceedings can run side by side without affecting each other, but in the instant case, we are of the considered opinion that the departmental proceedings were not conducted in accordance with law. The authority and the inquiry officer badly failed to abide by the relevant rules in letter and spirit. The procedure as prescribed had not been adhered to strictly. All the formalities had been completed in a haphazard manner, which depicted somewhat indecent haste. Moreover, the appellant was acquitted of the same charges by the criminal court; hence, there remains no ground to further retain the penalty so imposed.

08. In view of the foregoing discussion, the instant appeal is accepted. The impugned orders are set aside and the appellant is re-instated in service with all back benefits. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

ANNOUNCED

19.01.2022


(AHMAD-SULTAN TAREEN)
CHAIRMAN



(ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR)
MEMBER (E)

ORDER
20.01.2022

Learned counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Additional Advocate General for respondent present. Arguments heard and record perused.

Vide our detailed judgment of today, separately placed on file, the instant appeal is accepted. The impugned orders are set aside and the appellant is re-instated in service with all back benefits. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

ANNOUNCED
20.01.2022



(AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN)
CHAIRMAN




(ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR)
MEMBER (E)

20.12.2021

Appellant with counsel present. Mr. Kabirullah Khattak,
Additional Advocate General for respondents present.

Former made a request for adjournment as he has not gone
through the record. Adjourned. To come up for arguments on
19.01.2022 before D.B.



(Atiq Ur Rehman Wazir)
Member (E)



Chairman

Muhammad Zahir 7034 of 2021

30.08.2021 Counsel for the appellant present. Preliminary arguments heard.

Learned counsel for the appellant argued that the appellant was nominated in FIR No. 335 dated 15.05.2020 who was acquitted in the criminal case on 20.01.2021 by the Addl: Sessions Judge-II/JMCTC Hangu. As he was behind the Bar and the impugned order dated 28.12.2020 was passed on his back. On acquittal in the case, he submitted departmental appeal on 26.01.2021 which was rejected by the appellate authority on 21.06.2021, hence, the instant service appeal before the Service Tribunal instituted on 05.07.2021.

Points raised need consideration. The appeal is admitted to regular hearing, subject to all just and legal objections including limitation. The appellant is directed to deposit security and process fee within 10 days. Thereafter, notices be issued to the respondents for submission of written reply/comments in office within 10 days after receipt of notices, positively. If the written reply/comments are not submitted within the stipulated time or extension of time is not sought, the office shall submit the file with a report of non-compliance. File to come up for arguments on 20.12.2021 before the D.B.

Appellant Deposited
Security & Process Fee

30/8/21



(Mian Muhammad)
Member(E)

Form- A

FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of _____

Case No.- 7034 /2021


S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1-	13/07/2021	<p>The appeal of Mr. Muhammad Zahir resubmitted today by Mr. Taimur Ali Khan Advocate may be entered in the Institution Register and put up to the Worthy Chairman for proper order please</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> REGISTRAR</p> <p>This case is entrusted to S. Bench for preliminary hearing to be put up there on <u>30/08/21</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;"> CHAIRMAN</p>
2-		

The appeal of Mr. Muhammad Zahir Ex-Constable no. 1993 District Orakzai received today i.e. on 06.07.2021 is incomplete on the following score which is returned to the counsel for the appellent for completion and resubmission within 15 days.

- 1- Annexures of the appeal may be attested.
- 2- Appeal has not been flagged/marked with annexures' marks.
- 3- Annexures-A and C of the appeal are illegible which may be replaced by legible/better one.
- 4- Copy of enquiry report is not attached with the appeal which may be placed on it.
- 5- Five more copies/sets of the appeal along with annexures i.e. complete in all respect may also be submitted with the appeal.

No. 1166 /S.T,

Dt. 07/07 /2021


REGISTRAR
SERVICE TRIBUNAL
KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
PESHAWAR.

M. Taimur Ali Khan Adv. Pesh.

Respected Sir,

- 1- Removed
- 2- Removed
- 3- Better copies of Annex-A & C are prepared.
- 4- 1st Inquiry report is attached as Annex-D page-12. while 2nd inquiry report has not provided to appellent so he is unable to attach with this appeal
- 5- Removed

Resubmitted after compliance



13/7/21

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL
PESHAWAR

SERVICE APPEAL NO. _____/2021

Muhammad zahir

V/S

Police Deptt:

INDEX

S. No.	Documents	Annexure	P. No.
01.	Memo of appeal	-----	01-05
02.	Affidavit	-----	06
02	Copy of FIR	A	07-08
03.	Copies of order dated 03.07.2020 and 21.03.2020	B&C	09-11
04.	Copies of inquiry report and statements of Muhammad Zahid and Zahid Ullah along with stamp papers	D&E	12-15
05.	Copy of order dated 28.12.2020	F	16
06.	Copies of judgment dated 20.01.2021, departmental appeal, letter dated 12.03.2021, order dated 16.03.2021 and rejection order	G,H,I,J&K	17-37
07.	Vakalat Nama	-----	38

APPELLANT

THROUGH:


(TAIMUR ALI KHAN)
ADVOCATE HIGH COURT

Room No. FR 8, 4th Flour,
Bilour plaza, Peshawar cantt:
Cell# 0333-9390916

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL
PESHAWAR

SERVICE APPEAL NO. 7034/2021

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal

Diary No. 6781

Dated 5/7/2021

Muhammad Zahir, Ex-Constable, No.1993,
District Orakzai.

(APPELLANT)

VERSUS

1. The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
2. The Regional Police Officer, Kohat Region Kohat.
3. The District Police Officer, Orakzai.

(RESPONDENTS)

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER
PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974
AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 28.12.2020, WHEREBY THE
APPELLANT WAS DISMISSED FROM SERVICE AND
AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 21.06.2021, WHEREBY THE
DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN
REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUND.

Filed to-day

Registrar

5/7/2021 PRAYER:

THAT ON ACCEPTANCE OF THIS APPEAL, THE ORDER
DATED 28.12.2020 AND 21.06.2021 MAY KINDLY BE SET
ASIDE AND THE RESPONDENTS MAY FURTHER BE
DIRECTED TO REINSTATE THE APPELLANT INTO HIS
SERVICE WITH ALL BACK AND CONSEQUENTIAL
BENEFITS. ANY OTHER REMEDY WHICH THIS AUGUST
TRIBUNAL DEEMS FIT AND APPROPRIATE THAT MAY
ALSO BE AWARDED IN FAVOUR OF APPELLANT.

Re-submitted to -day
and filed.

Registrar
13/7/2021

RESPECTFULLY SHEWTH:

FACTS:

1. That the appellant joined the department in the year 1998 and since his appointment, the appellant has performed his duty with great devotion and honesty, whatsoever, assigned to him and no complaint has been filed against him regarding his performance.
2. That the appellant was falsely implicated in criminal case vide FIR 335 dated 15.05.2020 u/s 302,324,427,34PPC PS City, District Hangu. **(Copy of FIR is attached as Annexure-A)**
3. That the appellant applied for ad-interim pre arrest bail which was granted, however, petition for pre arrest bail was dismissed and ad interim pre arrest was recalled on 03.07.2020 and was arrested on the spot. The appellant then applied for regular bail, but his bail petition was also dismissed on 21.07.2020. **(Copies of order dated 03.07.2020 and 21.03.2020 are attached as Annexure-B&C)**
4. That SDPO upper conducted inquiry against the appellant without issuing charge sheet to the appellant, however the inquiry officer mentioned in his report that undersigned visited the Goda Post and constables namely Muhammad Zahid and Zahid Ullah gave statements that the appellant being incharge of Goda Post was present at the time of occurrence in the post and in this respect they also gave that statements on Stamp Paper on which the inquiry gave finding that the appellant was falsely charged in the criminal case. **(Copies of inquiry report and statements of Muhammad Zahid and Zahid Ullah along with stamp papers are attached as Annexure-D&E)**
5. That without giving any reason by competent authority for not agreeing with the finding of inquiry report conducted by SDPO upper, another inquiry was conducted against the appellant by SDPO Lower, but neither charge sheet was communicated to the appellant in Prison as the appellant was behind the bar at the time of inquiry proceeding, nor he was not associated in that inquiry proceeding, so, that he may be defended himself. Even the inquiry report was not provided to the appellant which may be requisite from the department and on the basis of that one sided inquiry and without issuing charge sheet and show cause notice, the appellant was dismissed from service vide order dated 28.12.2020. **(Copy of order dated 28.12.2020 is attached as Annexure-F)**
6. That the appellant was acquitted by the competent court of law after proper trial vide judgment dated 20.01.2021 and after acquittal he

went to department to join his duty, but he was informed that he has been dismissed from service vide order dated 28.12.2020, against which the appellant filed department appeal on 26.01.2021 on which the appellate authority directed respondent No.3 vide letter dated 12.03.2021 to initiate formal inquiry against the appellant on which respondent No.3 appointed SP Investigation to conduct re-inquiry against the appellant vide order dated 16.03.2021. The SP Investigation conducted re-inquiry against the appellant which was also culminated in the favour of the appellant, however re-inquiry report was not provided to the appellant, which may requisite from the department. The appellate authority rejected departmental appeal of the appellant on 21.06.2021 for no good grounds. **(Copies of judgment dated 20.01.2021, departmental appeal, letter dated 12.03.2021, order dated 16.03.2021 and rejection order are attached as Annexure-G,H,I,J&K)**

7. That the appellant has no other remedy except to file the instant service appeal in this Honourable Tribunal on the following grounds amongst others.

GROUND:

- A. That the impugned orders dated 28.12.2020 and 21.06.2021 are against the law, facts, norms of justice and material on record, therefore, not tenable and liable to be set aside.
- B. That SDPO upper conducted inquiry against the appellant in which he mentioned in inquiry report that undersigned visited the Goda Post and constables namely Muhammad Zahid and Zahid Ullah gave statements that the appellant being incharge of Goda Post was present at the time of occurrence in the post and in this respect they also gave that statements on Stamp Paper on which the inquiry gave finding that the appellant was falsely charged in the criminal case, but the competent authority conducted another inquiry without giving any reason for not agreeing with the report of that inquiry, which is against the norms of justice and fair play.
- C. That 2nd inquiry was conducted against the appellant by SDPO Lower on the basis of which the appellant penalized, but the appellant was not associated in that inquiry proceeding as neither charge sheet was communicated to the appellant in Prison as the appellant was behind the bar at the time of inquiry proceeding, nor the inquiry officer recorded the statement of the appellant and gave him opportunity of

cross examination, but despite the inquiry officer held him responsible, which is against the law, rules and inquiry proceeding and as such the impugned order is liable to set aside on this ground alone.

- D. That no opportunity of defence was provided to the appellant during inquiry proceeding, which is violation of Article-10A of the Constitution of Pakistan.
- E. That charge sheet and statement of allegations were not communicated to the appellant, which is violation of law and rules.
- F. That show cause was not served to the appellant before passing the impugned order of dismissal, which is against the norms of justice and fair play.
- G. That even the inquiry report on the basis of which the appellant was dismissed from service was not provided to the appellant, which is not permissible under the law.
- H. That the appellant was falsely implicated in criminal case and as per Civil Service Regulations, 194-A, the appellant should be suspended till the conclusion of criminal case pending against him, but the appellant was dismissed from service without waiting to conclusion of criminal case pending against him, which is violation of CSR, 194-A.
- I. That the appellant was falsely implicated in the criminal case and on the allegation of that criminal case the appellant was dismissed from service, but the appellant was Honourably acquitted in that criminal case by the competent court of law after trial, therefore, there remain no ground to penalize the appellant on the basis of that criminal case.
- J. That as per superior court judgment that mere allegation of commission of an offence and registration of FIR against a person would not ipso facto made him guilty rather he would be presumed to be innocent until convicted by a competent court, but the appellant was dismissed from service merely on the basis of FIR in which he was also acquitted.
- K. That the appellant did not comment the offence as he was present at Goda Post at the time of the occurrence and in this respect constables namely Muhammad Zahid and Zahid Ullah gave statements that the

appellant being incharge of Goda Post was present at the time of occurrence in the post and in this respect they also gave that statements on Stamp Paper on which the inquiry gave finding that the appellant was falsely charged in the criminal case, which shows that the appellant has been punished for no fault on his part.

- L. That re-inquiry conducted against the appellant on his departmental appeal was also culminated in the favour of the appellant, but appellate authority rejected the departmental appeal of the appellant without giving any reason.
- M. That the appellant has been condemned unheard and has not been treated according to law and rules.
- N. That the appellant seeks permission to advance others grounds and proofs at the time of hearing.

It is, therefore most humbly prayed that the appeal of the appellant may be accepted as prayed for.



APPELLANT

Muhammad Zahir

THROUGH:



(TAIMUR ALI KHAN)
ADVOCATE HIGH COURT

CERTIFICATE:

It is certified that no other similar service appeal between the parties has been filed earlier.



DEPONENT

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL
PESHAWAR

SERVICE APPEAL NO. _____/2021

Muhammad Zahir

V/S

Police Deptt:

.....

AFFIDAVIT

I, Muhammad Zahir, Ex-Constable No.1993, District Orakzai, (Appellant) do hereby affirm and declare that the contents of this service appeal are true and correct and nothing has been concealed from this Honourable Tribunal.



DEPONENT

Muhammad Zahir
(APPELLANT)

A 7

ابتدائی اطلاع رپورٹ

کاؤنٹر فائل

ابتدائی اطلاع نسبت جرم قابل دست اندازی پولیس رپورٹ شدہ زیر نمبر 153 مجموعہ ضابطہ نو جہادری

تھانہ	33	ضلع	سنگو
نمبر	335	تاریخ	15/05/2011 وقت 08:15
1- تاریخ وقت رپورٹ		2- نام و سکونت اطلاع دہندہ	وقت 09:20
3- مختصر کیفیت جرم (معدومہ) حال اگر مختصر	216011-07102116-9	3- نام و سکونت اطلاع دہندہ	وقت 10:00
4- جلتے وقوعہ کا ضلع تھانہ سے درست	0331-0294164	5- نام و سکونت لڑم	37/38 سال
6- کارروائی جو پیش کی گئی اگر اطلاع درج کرتے ہیں	0331-0294164	7- کارروائی جو پیش کی گئی اگر اطلاع درج کرتے ہیں	PPC 302-324-4127-34
8- تھانہ سے راہگی کی تاریخ وقت		9- کارروائی جو پیش کی گئی اگر اطلاع درج کرتے ہیں	ظاہر دہندہ عمل خانہ سکول خلع اور نئی خانہ کلاں

ابتدائی اطلاع نیچے درج کرو۔ بطور تہہ تہہ رپورٹ

جناب عالی! ایک تحریری وراسلہ منجانب۔
 محمد رحیم ASHO زمانہ سٹی بوردت وسطی علی LHC موصول ہو کر درج ذیل ہے۔
 دعوت سٹی سنگو حسب اطلاع سول ہسپتال سنگو ایمر جینی روم آیا۔
 لعدیش اذان وز پیر گل ولہ
 عالم محل پیر 6/62 سال قوم دلا خیل خلع اور نئی خانہ کلاں سنگو جو جو باکر بحق مقبول
 ایمر اسٹی محمد عادل ولہ روز پیر گل پیر 37/38 سال سنگو باجو ترنگ سنگو
 جو باجو پیر 12/294164-0331 یوں رپورٹ کرتا ہے۔
 کہ حضور جمع میں مع والد ام وز پیر گل بزمن
 سزا دہندہ ضرورت بازار سنگو آئے تھے۔
 اور سنا ہوا آڈہ سے روکتے پھیل کر کے بیٹھ گئے۔
 جب بمقام جانے و توجہ بالا پھینکے تو بیٹھ سے
 دیان پیر صہیان ایوب ولہ کھل رہت تھا سنگو باجو ترنگ۔
 ظاہر دہندہ عمل خانہ سنگو خلع اور نئی خانہ کلاں
 کلاں کو باٹ خالچ ٹانوف مسلح ہوا ایمر آدیشن جو جو تھے۔
 بیٹھ دیکھتے ہی با ابرادہ قتل فلز ٹنگ
 شروع کر کے جن کے خائون سے رات کے اندر والد ام وز پیر گل تک کر شد پیر زخمی ہوا جبکہ
 میں اور کاشف را زینور خوشن قہمی سے بچ گئے۔
 والد ام وز پیر گل بز موقع زخموں کی تاب نہ
 لاکر جان بحق ہوا۔
 بعد و توجہ و زمانہ موقع سے فرار ہوئے۔
 وہر عروستہ ملزمان کبسا تو
 قتل وقت تلہ کی دہنھی چلی آ رہی ہے۔
 میں والد ام وز پیر گل کے قتل اپنے اور کبشہ ڈرامیور
 پر خائون ٹنگ کرنے اور کاشف کی نقہ مان وسانی کا بند خلاف متذکرہ بالا کسان کو پیر ہوں
 رپورٹ پہلی جا کر غور ہوئے۔
 اور کاشف ایمر کلاں کلاں ہسپتال سے نکل رپورٹ درج بالا
 ہو کر دہندہ دست تسلیم کرتے زیر رپورٹ خود نشانہ لگو تھا تھی۔
 پہلی میں لعدہ جن کلاں
 ہوں۔
 عدتوں وز پیر گل کے کلاں سے تیار کرتے ہوں۔
 کلاں سے تیار کرتے ہوں۔
 کلاں سے تیار کرتے ہوں۔

Handwritten signature

ATTACHED

14/01-1582020-9

Handwritten signature or mark

Handwritten text, possibly a title or header, partially obscured by a stamp.

Two horizontal lines, likely a separator or part of a form.

15.05.20
MSM
Handwritten text

Main body of handwritten text, appearing to be a list or detailed notes.

Handwritten signature or mark at the bottom of the page.

ابتدائی اطلاعی رپورٹ

Better copy

ابتدائی اطلاع نسبت جرم قابل دست اندازی پولیس رپورٹ شدہ زیر دفعہ 154 مجموعہ ضابطہ فوجداری

ضلع: ہنگو

تھانہ: شی

(7)

تاریخ و وقت وقوع: 05/01/1987 وقت 12:30 بجے

علت نمبر 33

1	تاریخ و وقت رپورٹ
2	نام و سکونت اطلاع دہندہ و مستغیث
3	مختصر کیفیت جرم (معد دفعہ) حال اگر کچھ لیا گیا ہو۔
4	جائے وقوعہ فاصلہ تھانہ سے اور سمت
5	نام و سکونت ملزم
6	کارروائی جو تفتیش کے متعلق کی گئی۔ اگر اطلاع درج کرنے میں توقف ہوا ہو تو وجہ بیان کرو۔
7	تھانہ سے روانگی کی تاریخ و وقت

ابتدائی اطلاع نیچے درج کرو:

جناب عالی: ایک تحریری مراسلہ منجانب محمد رحیم ASHO تھانہ شی بدست مصطفیٰ علی LHC موصول ہو کر درج ذیل ہے۔ بخدمت آفیسر انچارج تھانہ شی ہنگو حسب اطلاع ہسپتال ہنگو امیر جنسی روم آیا تفتیش ازاں وزیر گل ولد عالم گل بمر 62/63 سال ملاخیل ضلع اور کزئی حال بابونگ ہنگو موجود پا کر بحق مقتول پسران محمد عادل ولد وزیر گل بمر 37/38 سال سکناہ بابونگ شناختی کارڈ نمبر 97102469-21604 موبائل نمبر 0294642-0331 یوں رپورٹ کرتا کہ امروز صبح میں معہ والد ام وزیر گل بفرض سودا سلف خریدنے بازار ہنگو آئے تھے۔ بعد سودا سلف خریدنے واپس گھر خود جا رہے تھے۔ اور شاہو آڈہ سے رکشہ سہیل کر کے بیٹھ گئے۔ جب مقام جائے بالا وقوعہ پہنچے تو پہلے سے وہاں پر مسمیان ایوب ولد گل بت خان سکناہ بابونگ ظاہر ولد عمل خان سکناہ ضلع اور کزئی حال کوہاٹ کالج ٹاؤن مسلح اسلحہ آتشین موجود تھے۔ ہمیں دیکھتے ہی بارادہ قتل فائرنگ شروع کر دی جن کے فائرنگ سے رکشہ کے اندر والد ام وزیر گل لگ کر شدید زخمی ہوا جب کہ میں اور رکشہ ڈرائیور خوش قسمتی سے بچ گئے۔ والد ام وزیر گل بر موقع زخموں کی تاب نہ لا کر جان بحق ہوا اور وقوعہ ملزمان موقع سے فرار ہو گئے۔ وجہ عداوت ملزمان کے ساتھ قتل و قاتلہ کی دشمنی چلی آرہی ہے۔ میں والد ام وزیر گل کے قتل اپنے اور رکشہ ڈرائیور پر فائرنگ کرنے اور رکشہ کی نقصان رسانی کا برخلاف متذکرہ بالا کسان دعویدار ہوں۔ رپورٹ لکھی جا کر غور ہوئے نشان انگوٹھا کارروائی پولیس حسب گفتہ سائل رپورٹ درج بالا ہو کر پڑھ کر درست تسلیم کر کے زیر رپورٹ خود نشان انگوٹھا ثبت کی۔ جس کی میں تصدیق کرتا ہوں۔ مقتول وزیر گل کے کاغذات مرگ تیار کر کے بفرض پوسٹ مارٹم زیر

ATTESTED

حفاظت حوالہ ڈاکٹر صاحب کی گئی مضمون رپورٹ سے صورت جرم بالا کی پائی جا کر مراسلہ بطور سپیشل رپورٹ اور LHC
بفرض چاکیدگی پرچہ ارسال تھانہ ہے۔ اور اندراج مقدمہ بفرض تفتیش حوالہ انوسٹی گیشن سٹاف ہوئے افسران بالا صاحبان کو
بذریعہ کنٹرول اطلاع دی جاتی ہے۔ دستخط انگریزی محمد رحیم خان ASHO تھانہ سٹی مورنہ 15/05/2020 کاروائی
تھانہ مراسلہ حرف بہ حرف درج بالا ہو کر پرچہ مجرم چاک دیا جاتا ہے قتل FIR بمعہ مراسلہ بفرض تفتیش حوالہ IBH سٹاف دیا
جاتا ہے۔ پرچہ بطور رپورٹ گزارش ہے۔

شفیع اللہ

MASI. PS.. City

15.05.2020

دستخط

عہدہ

15/05/2020

IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD TAYYIB,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II/JUDGE MCTC, HANGU

B 9

BBA No.29/4 of 2020

Muhammad Zahir ...vs... The State etc.

Order---04
03.07.2020

Accused/petitioner Muhammad Zahir s/o Mian Khan on ad-interim pre-arrest bail alongwith counsel Mr. Anjum Khan Advocate present. Complainant alongwith Mr. Noor Awaz Advocate and Mr. Naeem Ullah Jan. learned APP for the State present.

Accused/petitioner named above seeks confirmation of ad-interim pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.335 dated 15/05/2020 u/s 302/324/427/34 PPC, Police Station City, Hangu.

Arguments heard, record gone through.

Pre requisite for grant of extra ordinary concession of anticipatory bail is the existence of malafide or ulterior motive of prosecution or complainant, however, on face of record, the same was not pointed out. In this backdrop, on the sole ground mentioned above, it is held that accused/petitioner is not entitle to the concession of pre-arrest bail. Hence, petition in hand is dismissed. Ad-interim pre-arrest bail-granted earlier is hereby recalled.

Moharrir is directed to annex copy of this order with judicial and police records, while file of this court be consigned to record room after its completion and compilation.

Announced:
03.07.2020

(Muhammad Tayyib)
Additional Sessions Judge-II/

ATTESTED

IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD TAYYIB,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II/JUDGE MCTC, HANGU

BA No.185/4 of 2020

Zahir ...vs... The State etc.

Order---05
21.07.2020

Accused/ petitioner through learned counsel Mr. Muhammad Saeed Khan Advocate, complainant alongwith learned counsel Mr. Noor Awaz Advocate and Mr. Zohaib Ahmad Sher, learned APP for the State present. Record received.

Accused/petitioner Zahir s/o Amal Khan seeks post arrest bail in case FIR No.335 dated 15/05/2020 n/s 302/324/427/34 PPC, Police Station City, District Hangu.

Accused/ petitioner named above alongwith other co-accused namely Ayub have been charged for committing Qatl-e-Amd of deceased Wazir Gul and attempting at the life of complainant Muhammad Adil by firing at him ineffectively vide aforesaid FIR. Motive for the occurrence was mentioned to be previous blood feud enmity.

Arguments heard, record gone through.

Record transpires that accused/ petitioner has directly been charged in a promptly lodged FIR with role of making firing at the deceased and complainant being attributed to him. The occurrence happened in broad day light and the parties being known to each other, there arise no question of misidentification or non-identification. Statement of the eye witness of the occurrence recorded u/s 161 Cr.PC, recovery of blood stained earth from the place where the deceased had fallen after being hit, presence of blood inside the Rickshaw, recovery of blood stained garments of

Yusuf
21-07-2020

~~ATTESTED~~

Better copy
10

IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD TAYYEB
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II/JUDGE MCTC HANGU
BA No. 185/4 of 2020
Zahir vs The State etc

Order---05
21.07.2020

Accused/Petitioner through leaned counsel Mr. Muhammad Saeed Khan Advocate, complainant alongwith learned counsel Mr. Noor Awaz Advocate and Mr. Zohaib Ahmad Sher, learned APP for the State present. Record received.

Accused/Petitioner Zahir S/o Amal Khan seeks post arrest bail in case FIR No. 335 Dated 15/05/2020 in u/s 302/324/427/34 PPC, Police Station City, District Hangu.

Accused/Petitioner named above other co-accused namely Ayub have been charged for committing Qatl-e Amd of deceased Wazir Gul and attempting at the life of complainant Muhammad Adil by firing at him inefficiently vide aforesaid FIR. Motive for the occurrence was mentioned to the previous blood feud enmity.

Arguments heard, record gone through.

Record transpires that accused/Petitioner has directly been charged in a promptly lodged FIR with role of making firing at the deceased and complainant being attributed to him. The occurrence happened in broad day light and the parties being known to each other, there arise no question of misidentification or non-identification. Statement of the eye witness of the occurrence recorded u/s 161 Cr. Pc, recovery of blood stained earth from the place where the deceased had after being hit, presence of blood inside the Rickshaw stained garments of

ATTESTED

the deceased, recovery of crime empties from the scene of occurrence, post mortem report of the deceased showing the deceased to have received multiple injuries and died due to damage of vital organs caused due to firearm and existence of previous enmity apparently supported by copy of FIR No.321 dated 06/06/1999, u/s 302/324/34 PPC. (available on the case file), support the case of prosecution. As far as plea of alibi of the accused/ petitioner is concerned, suffice to say that not only the same amounts to deeper appreciation which is not warranted at bail stage but the same needs evidence and would be proved by the accused/ petitioner during trial.

Tentatively assessing the record, reasonable grounds exist which prima facie connect accused/ petitioner with the commission of offence and as such he is not entitle to the concession of bail.

For the reasons stated above, the instant bail petition stands dismissed.

The observations made herein above are tentative in nature and would have no effect on final outcome of the case.

Requisitioned record, alongwith copy of this order be returned, while file of this court be consigned to record room after its necessary completion and compilation.

Announced:

21/07/2020

Muhammad Tayyib
(Muhammad Tayyib)
Additional Sessions Judge-II/
Judge MCTC, Hangu

ATTESTED

Better copy (11)

the deceased, recovery of crime empties from the scene of occurrence, post mortem report of the deceased showing the deceased to have received multiple injuries and died due to damage of vital organs caused due to firearm and existence of previous enmity apparently supported by copy of FIR No. 321 dated 06/06/1999, u/s 302/324/34 PPC (available on the case file) support the case of prosecution. As far as plea of alibi of the accused/Petitioner is concerned, suffice to say that not only the same amounts to deeper appreciation which is not warranted at bail stage but the same needs evidence and would be proved by the accused/Petitioner during trial.

Tentatively assessing the record, reasonable grounds exist which prima facie connect accused/ Petitioner with the commission of offence and as such he is not entitle to the concession of bail.

For the reason stated above the instant bail petition stands dismissed.

The observations made herein above are tentative in nature and would have no effect on final outcome of the case.

Requisitioned record alongwith copy of this order be returned, while file of this court be consigned to in record room after its necessary completion and compilation.

Announced

21/07/2020

(Muhammad Tayyeb)

Additional Sessions Judge-II/

Judge MCTC, Hangu

~~ATTACHED~~

Barcode and header information including 'UPPER ORAKZAI' and 'S.D.P.O.'.

فائل درجہ

فائل نمبر

5

12

جانب عالی

درخواست ازان محمد ظاہر ولد مہاں خان سہ قلم والیہ ضلع بہاولپور
 لیٹرن انٹرویو سے S.D.P.O. اتر اورکن کوٹھان D.P.O. دہ ضلع سے مارکر
 ہو کر درخواست کنندہ پر قدم عالت 335⁰⁵ درجہ 15⁰⁵ جم 302.324
 427.34 2020
 تمام رقم جینگو میں نامزد ملزم اور دعویداروں پر ہی ہے اور
 ہم ٹری کے گورڈ ایجنٹ خاں ویاں پر جو کسٹڈن سے سلوٹ
 سے برارہا کے دستوں نے ظاہر نکال کر بندر جمع درجہ 15⁰⁵ کو محمد ظاہر ولد
 بطور ایجنٹ ایجنٹ پر وجود تھا۔ ایجنٹ پر وجود دیکھ کر
 کے سائنات کے خاں اور حلقہ سیکس سپر ریمن سائنات دئے گی
 پر ایجنٹ ہو گی۔ جہاں تک انٹرویو سے معلومات برارہا نہیں تو محمد ظاہر
 کی موجودگی اپنے ایجنٹ پر معلوم ہوئی ہے۔ محمد ظاہر ولد مہاں خان
 پر ناخائز دعویداروں پر ہی درجہ 9


Ummar
 S.D.P.O. UPPER
 S.D.P.O
 UPPER ORAKZAI

ATTESTED


مستحقان زاید القم ولد ورتہ خان مسموع اللہ علیہ صل علیہ صلہ منافعہ کاردر
 5-669668-21602 واپار نمبر 9528840-0336 کے درمیان بیان
 کیا کہ محمد ظاہر دم بیان خان مسموع اللہ علیہ حال کا بل گاؤں ٹوہان پورہ
 بروز جوئے مسموع 15⁰⁵ کی مبارک سائٹ گودا پورہ اور پورہ جوئے
 لکھا۔ مزید صفحہ عدالت میں دونوں اور مزید سائٹ سہ
 یہ بیان حلفیہ دونوں۔ یہ یہ مہربان ہے، جو درست ہے

2 مستحقان زاید دم محمد ظاہر خان مسموع اللہ علیہ صل علیہ صلہ منافعہ کاردر
 3-8656971-21604 واپار نمبر 5994860-0333 کے درمیان بیان
 گودا پورہ اور انجارج محمد ظاہر کے مسموع مبارک سائٹ گودا پورہ اور پورہ جوئے
 لکھا ہے بروز جوئے مسموع 15⁰⁵ کی مبارک سائٹ محمد ظاہر کے گاؤں ٹوہان پورہ
 لکھا جوئے لکھا۔ مزید صفحہ عدالت میں محمد ظاہر کے حق دونوں اور
 اور حلفیہ بیان سائٹ سہ لکھ کر دونوں۔ یہ یہ مہربان ہے، جو درست ہے

ATTESTED



14



بیان صلح

میں اس تحریر کی رو سے صلحاً اقرار کر کے لکھ دیتے ہیں کہ مورخہ ۱۵/۰۲/۲۰۲۰ کو منجی
 محمد ظاہر ولد مرہوں خان سکس ٹونم ریفیصل حال کابل پٹاؤں کو پکٹ لیزرز و قاعدہ تحوالہ
 مقدمہ نمبر 335 مورخہ ۱۵/۰۲/۲۰۲۰ صبراً 34، 427، 324، 302 کے خلاف منجی نے ہنگامہ پیش کیا مقدمہ
 درج رہیں ہوئی ہے۔ مذکورہ بالا 3 میرے ساتھ پولیس پوسٹ گھوڑا میں بحیثیت راجپور
 نکلے پولیس کی ڈیوٹی پر موجود تھا میں صلحاً اور تحریر سے منجی سے صلحاً ہو گیا ہے اور اس کے متعلق
 کرتا ہوں کہ یہ مقدمہ غلط اور بے بنیاد اسے لیزر جسٹریکٹ ہے اور اس کے متعلق
 میں باقاعدہ منجی پولیس ہنگو اعدالت کو مذکورہ کی لیزر پکٹ میں ڈیوٹی پر موجودگی
 اور لیزر قسم کی صلحاً بیان / گواہی کرنے کیلئے تیار ہوں۔ صلحاً بیان کنٹینر
 زاید اللہ ولد وزیر خان باقاعدہ منجی سے صلحاً ہو گیا ہے کہ تمام بطور گواہی میں منجی
 پولیس اعدالت کو پیش کی جا سکتی ہے یہ بیان منجی سے صلحاً ہو گیا ہے کہ تمام بطور ریکارڈ
 منجی کے صلحاً کے ساتھ

علی


الذی فیہ اللہ ولد وزیر خان ریفیصل بابی صلحاً

ATTESTED


5-6696632-2062-2020

9528340-0336-2020

زاید اللہ



15



بیان حلفی

میں اس فخریہ کی رو سے حلفاً اقرار کرتے ہوئے ہیں کہ مورخہ 15⁰⁵/₀₂₀ کو مسس محمد ظاہر ولد
 میاں خان سکنہ قوم ربیع خیل حال کالج ٹاؤن کو یاٹ بہر ذریعہ حوالہ مقدمہ عدالت 335
 مورخہ 15⁰⁵/₀₂₀ ج (م 34، 427، 324، 302) کے تھانہ سٹی، ہنگو کا مقدمہ درج رجسٹر ہوئی ہے
 مذکورہ بالا میرے ساتھ پولیس جو سٹ گورڈ میں بحیثیت ایچارج ASI، پولیس کی
 ڈیوٹی پر موجود تھا میں حلفاً اور فخریہ سٹامپ پیش کر رہا ہوں کہ یہ
 مقدمہ غلط اور بے بنیاد اس پر رجسٹر کی گئی ہے اور اس کے متعلق میں باقاعدہ مقامی پولیس
 ہنگو/عدالت کو مذکورہ کی جو سٹ میں ڈیوٹی پر موجودگی اور یہ قسم کی حلفاً بیان کرنا
 فخریہ کر کے تاکہ بطور گواہی مقامی پولیس/عدالت کو پیش کی جائے گی فخریہ بیان
 سٹامپ پیش کر کے تاکہ بطور ریکارڈ شامل مقدمہ کی جائے گی۔


المحمد زائد ولد ظہیر علی خان قوم ربیع خیل ٹاؤن فرانس خیل

محمد زائد

CNIC: 21604-8656971-3

Mob: 0333-5994868

ATTESTED



**OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT POLICE
OFFICER ORAKZAI**

F
16

OFFICE ORDER:-

The order will dispose off the departmental enquiry conducted against Constable Muhammad Zahir s/o Meen Khan of Rabia Khel tribe under the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Police Rules, (Amended 2014) 1975.

Constable Muhammad Zahir s/o Meen Khan was charged/involved in FIR No. 335 dated 15.05.2020 U/S 302/324/427/34 PPC PS City District Hangu.

He was suspended vide order OB No. 920 dated 29.10.2020 and SDPO Lower was nominated as enquiry officer to scrutinize the conduct of the accused official. The enquiry officer vide his finding and found him guilty of the charges leveled against him, and recommend him for major punishment.

These act of the accused official earned bad name to a discipline force on one hand and involved himself in criminal act.

In view of the above and available record, i reached to the conclusion that the accused official was involved in criminal act. Therefore, these charges leveled against accused Constable Muhammad Zahir s/o Meen Khan have been established beyond any shadow of doubt. Therefore, in exercise of powers conferred upon me under the rules. ibid, a major punishment of "dismissed from service from the date of suspension" is imposed on accused Constable Muhammad Zahir s/o Meen Khan with immediate effect. Kit etc issued to the Constable be collected.

Announced OB No. 1933

Dated 28/12/2020

DISTRICT POLICE OFFICER, ORAKZAI

No 284 /EC/OASI Dated 28/12 /2020.

Copy of above to the:-

1. The Regional Police Officer, Kohat.
2. DSP HQrs.
3. SDPO Upper for collection of items and clearance.
4. Pay Officer/SRC/OHC/Reader for necessary action.


DISTRICT POLICE OFFICER, ORAKZAI

OASI

[Handwritten signature]

کوالیٹی ریٹرنس سیشن جج صاحب II صدر
5657/II P مورہ 11/9/20 11/9/20
سکاڑم ظاہر و نرت
20/01/2021 مورہ 15/15/20 مورہ 30/30/20 مورہ 335

17



2

Order:

APP for the State present. Accused Zahir produced in custody. Arguments heard and record perused.

Vide my detailed judgment of today, consisting of sixteen pages, separately placed on file, prosecution failed to bring home the charge against the accused facing trial, hence, by extending the benefit of doubt, the accused facing trial is hereby acquitted. Accused is in custody; be set free if not required in any other case.

As far as absconding accused namely Ayub Gul is concerned, he has already been proceeded u/s 512 Cr.PC. Sufficient material exists on case file which prima facie connect him with the commission of offence, therefore, he is hereby declared as proclaimed offender and perpetual warrant of his arrest be issued with the direction to quarter concerned for enlisting his name in the register of PO's.

Case property, be dealt intact till the arrest, trial and disposal of case against the absconding accused Ayub Gul.

File be consigned to record room after necessary completion and compilation.

ANNOUNCED
20/01/2021


CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
25/1/21
EXAMINED
COPYING AGENCY HANGU

Azmulah
(Azmulah Mishwani)
Add: Sessions Judge-II/JMCTC/ISC
Hangu

~~ATTACHED~~

18

IN THE COURT OF AZIMULLAH MISHWANI
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II/
JUDGE MODEL CRIMINAL TRIAL COURT/
JUDGE SPECIAL COURT, HANGU.



Session Case # 57/II-P

Date of Institution..... 11/09/2020
Date of Hearing..... 20/01/2021
Date of Decision..... 20/01/2021

The State

VERSUS

Zahir, s/o Amal Khan r/o Babu
Tang, presently residing at College
Town District Kohat.

(Handwritten mark)

(Handwritten mark)

.....(Accused facing trial)

FIR # 335 DATED 15/05/2020
U/S 302/324/427/34 PPC, POLICE STATION CITY,
DISTRICT HANGU.

J U D G M E N T

1. The accused Zahir faced trial in afore captioned case.
2. Compendium facts as per the FIR are such that; on 15/05/2020, in the emergency room of Civil Hospital, Hangu, the complainant reported the matter to the effect that: on the fateful day, he alongwith his deceased father had gone to Bazaar for purchasing items. Upon their return back in a rickshaw, when they reached near the place of occurrence, accused facing trial Zahir alongwith absconding co-accused, already present there duly armed with

EXAMINED
AGENCY HANGU

ATTESTED

firearm weapons, started firing upon them. As a result, thereof, his father Wazir Gul got hit, who then succumbed to his injuries, while he alongwith Rickshaw driver luckily escaped unhurt, whereas, Rickshaw was also hit and damaged. Motive is stated to be previous blood feud enmity between the parties. The episode was reported through Murasifa (Ex.PA/1) culminated into FIR (Ex.PA).

3. After completion of investigation, Prosecution submitted complete challan against accused facing trial u/s 512 Cr.PC. Later on 08/06/2020, accused Zahir got arrested and prosecution submitted supplementary challan against him. Trial was commenced. Charge against accused facing trial was framed to which he claimed trial by pleading not guilty. Hence, prosecution was accorded opportunity to adduce its evidence. Detail of evidence so recorded is given table given below;

PWs	Name	Role	Documents exhibited
SW-1	Muhammad Raees Constable No.46	Executed warrant u/s 204 Cr.PC and proclamation Notice u/s 87 Cr.PC issued against Ayub.	Warrant Ex.SW-1/1 Report overleaf Ex.SW-1/2 Proclamation Notice Ex.SW-1/3 Report Ex.SW-1/4
PW-1	Doctor Jibran	Conducted post mortem of deceased Wazir Gul	Post Mortem Report Ex.PM consisting of six sheets including pictorials.
PW-2	Shali Ullah Khan MASI	Scriber of FIR	FIR Ex.PA
PW-3	Shah Dauran Khan SHO	Submitted	PM report Ex.PM

		complete challan u/s 512 Cr.PC against both the accused and has submitted supplementary challan against accused facing trial Zahir	Challan U/s 512 Cr.PC Ex.PW-3/1 Supplementary challan Ex.PW-3/2
50	PW-4	Wali Ullah No.517	...
AA	PW-5	Muhammad Raees No.46	Witness to recovery memo's Ex.PC, Ex.PC/1 and Ex.PC/2. Taken the parcels to FSL vide receipt Ex.PW-5/1. Executed warrant u/s 204 Cr.PC and proclamation Notice u/s 87 Cr.PC issued against Ayub.
	PW-6	Nazir Badshah ASI	Witness to recovery memo Ex.PW-6/1.
	PW-7	Muhammad Adil	Complainant.
	PW-8	Dildar	Identifier of dead body of deceased before the doctor
	PW-9	Rahim Khan S.I/SHO	Scriber of Murasila. Prepared injury sheet and inquest report of deceased
			Murasila Ex.PA/1 Injury sheet Ex.PW-9/1 Inquest report

21

			Ex.PW-9/2
PW-10	Muhammad Munir	Rickshaw driver/ Witness to the occurrence	
			Site Plan Ex.PB Recovery memo Ex.PC Recovery memo Ex.PC/1 Photographs Ex.PS & Ex.PS/1 Search memo Ex.PC/2 Recovery memo Ex.PW-11/1 List of LRs of deceased Ex.PW- 11/2 Copy of FIR Ex.PW-11/3 Proceedings u/s 204 & 87 Cr.PC vide application Ex.PW-11/4 & Ex.PW-11/5. Card of arrest Ex.PW-11/6 Card of arrest Ex.PW-11/7 Application for
PW-11	Abdur Rehman Khan Inspector	Conducted investigation	

50

AA

25/1/21

~~ATTESTED~~

			obtaining custody of accused Ex.PW-11/8 Application for pre & post medical examination of accused ex.PW-11/9. Revenue record Ex.PW-11/10 FSL result Ex.PZ
PW-12	Muhammad Musa	Examined the Rickshaw	Report Ex.PW-12/1

4. Rest of the prosecution witnesses were abandoned by the prosecution.
5. On completion of the prosecution evidence, statements of accused were recorded u/s 342 Cr.PC on 12/01/2021, wherein the accused facing trial professed innocence, however, did not wish to produce defense evidence.
6. APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for complainant, inter alia, contended that the accused facing trial has directly been charged for the commission of offence; that there arises no chance of misidentification; that the complainant was lengthy cross examined but nothing favourable to defense was brought on record. That minor discrepancies in the statements of PWs are ignorable. That ocular evidence was supported, by medical

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
 25/1/21
 EXAMINER
 COPYING AGENCY HANGA

~~ATTESTED~~

evidence and other circumstantial evidence and as such the prosecution has proved its case beyond any shadow of doubt.

7. On the other hand, learned counsel for the defense argued that the accused has been falsely implicated by the complainant party and sufficient doubt exists in identification of the accused on the spot; that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of accused and mere absention is not sufficient for recording conviction of accused as case of prosecution is full of material doubts.
8. Heard and record perused.
9. The very genesis of the prosecution case as set out in the report Ex.PA is that the complainant in company of his deceased father had come to Hangu Bazar for fetching grocery and after doing the needful hired a Rickshaw to proceed to home. When reached the place of occurrence, the accused facing trial alongwith his absconding co-accused allegedly armed present there, started firing on seeing them with which his deceased father was hit inside the Rickshaw and got injured while he alongwith driver of the Rickshaw escaped luckily unhurt. Deceased succumbed to his injuries while the accused decamped from the spot.
10. To substantiate the indictment against the accused facing trial, prosecution has got examined 12 PWs; out of whom PW-1 Doctor Jibran conducted post mortem on the dead body of the deceased as follow;

53

AA

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

25/1/21
EXAMINED
COPYING AGENCY HANGU

~~ATTACHED~~

25

Disease or deformity nil. Fracture skull left arm.

Dislocation nil.

Remarks: In his opinion, the deceased died due to firearm injury resulting in damaging of vital organ, i-e brain. Probable time elapsed between injury and death about 10 to 30 minutes, while between death and postmortem 1 to 2 hours. His report is ExPM consisting of six sheets including two pictorials.

As per the contention of PW-1, he conducted the post mortem of the deceased at 09:00 am, however, he is not sure about the time of bringing the dead body to the hospital by the police official, who handed him over the injury sheet and inquest report as well. He has opened the dead body of the deceased during the post mortem but has not mentioned about presence of any food supplement in the stomach of the deceased. Further that four major entry and exit wounds were found having the same entry and exit sizes and dimensions. Regarding direction of all the four wound he narrates that it to have been caused from left to right, while the line of multiple entries was found from front side towards back.

11. Perpetrator of the case as PW-7 on reiterating his report introduces and surfaces a new fact during his cross examination by contending that on reaching the place of occurrence, the accused appeared from front side on motorcycle, however, he is not able to say as to who out of the accused was on its driving seat. Further narrates that at the time of firing the Rickshaw was

25/1/21

~~ATTESTED~~

in running position and the accused started firing from the right side of the Rickshaw with which his father got hit inside the Rickshaw. Here it merits mentioning that as per the direction of the fire assimilated from the wounds by PW-1, its entry was from left to right side, while, as per the complainant PW-7 his father was sitting in Rickshaw on his right side, which seems not synchronized with each other as if the complainant is believed then the bullet must have hit firstly the complainant but his escaping unhurt is indeed mind pricking. Further that when firing was made he as well as the Rickshaw driver alighted from the Rickshaw leaving the deceased in the Rickshaw in injured condition and both of them ran way towards the fields. He while contradicting with the contents of his report contends that the accused fired at them with pistol, thus, in further contrast to his report further narrates that the accused suddenly appeared on motorcycle from a street and that he did not know as to whether the accused were already present there and waiting for them or not. This fact has been concealed in derogation of his report; wherein he has specifically mentioned that when they reached the place of occurrence the accused were already present there, who made fire at them. As per his further deposition in cross examination, when he alongwith the driver came back to the spot after 5/10 minutes, his father was by then dead and they then shifted the dead body of deceased in a police pick up who came there at 09:00 am and they took the dead body to the hospital ta

30
 AA

25/1/21

ATTESTED

denies to know the fact that the accused facing trial Zahir was serving in police department, however, he is acquainted with his address of College Town, Kohat where he resides.

12. PW-4 contends that he was on duty in causality at Civil hospital Hangu alongwith two constables and one IIC and that the dead body of the deceased was brought to the hospital at about 09:30/10:00 am and terms it incorrect that the dead body was brought to the hospital in a police pickup. He has received the injury sheet and inquest report of the deceased alongwith the dead body for handing over to the doctor after 09:30/10:00 am. This PW-4 further negates and contradicts not only the concerned doctor (PW-1), who has shown the time of conducting the post mortem of the deceased at 09:00 am but also controverts the complainant (PW-7) who states that the police had not examined the injuries of the deceased.
13. PW-5 being marginal witness to the recovery memo Ex.PC vide which the I.O took into possession blood and from points No.4 & 5 eleven empties of 9 MM were also recovered in his presence. During his cross examination, he contends that when they were going to the spot from PS they were accompanied by Rickshaw driver and the complainant but the I.O as PW-11 states that when he reached to the spot the complainant and the Rickshaw driver were already present there alongwith the Rickshaw.
14. Identifier of the dead body namely Dildar (PW-8) contended that he identified the dead body of the deceased in the hospital at

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

EXAMINER
COPYING AGENCY HANGU

ATTESTED

29

09:00 am. Thus, he also contradicts the complainant (PW-7) and PW-4 who shows time of bringing the dead body to the hospital as 09:30/10:00 am as already commented upon.

15. Rahim Khan (PW-9) has reiterated the contents of report which he incorporated as Murasila (Ex.PA/I). In cross examination, he contends that he was present in the PS when information regarding the incident was received at about 09:00 am, where after going there he consumed ten minutes in scribing the injury sheet and inquest report after which the dead body was sent for autopsy alongwith injury sheet and inquest report, where after he started scribing report of the complainant. Admits that the complainant has not shown any specification of the arms used by the accused. This PW-9 also contradicts the complainant (PW-7) as well as PW-4 in their depositions regarding the arrival of the dead body in the hospital.


16. Muhammad Munir (PW-10) is the rickshaw driver who states that on 15/05/2020, his Rickshaw was hired by the deceased from Shahoo Adda, Hangu bazaar for Mala Khelo Kalay and when reached the place of occurrence suddenly two muffled persons appeared and made firing at the Rickshaw due to fear he fled away leaving his Rickshaw on the spot and when came back the passenger was lying dead in the Rickshaw. This PW-10 was then declared as hostile witness on the request of the prosecution with full opportunity for cross examining the PW by the prosecution but the witness could not be shattered and was found adamant on

certified true copy
 25/1/21
 EXAMINED
 COPY IN AGENCY FILE

ATTESTED

To,

The Regional Police Officer,
Kohat Region.



Subject: DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL AGAINST THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 28/12/2020 COMMUNICATED TO THE APPLICANT ON 22/01/2021 WHEREBY MAJOR PENALTY OF DISMISSAL FROM SERVICE HAS BEEN IMPOSED ON THE APPLICANT.

RESPECTED SIR,

With due respect it is stated that the applicant was the employee of your good self department and performing his duty as constable No. 1993 quite efficiently and up to the entire satisfaction of his superiors. That during service the applicant was falsely charged in criminal case FIR No. 335, vide dated 15/05/2020 Under Section 302/324/327/34 PCC registered in Police Station City Hangu. That after chalking of the above mentioned FIR the applicant was suspended vide dated 29/10/2020 and the applicant approached the court of law for the grant of BBA and the same was granted to applicant. That later on the said BBA was recalled and the applicant was sent to the prison. That the applicant faced trial in the said criminal case, while the criminal charges leveled against the applicant have not been proved and the applicant was Honourably acquitted by the Trial Court Hangu vide judgment dated 20/01/2021. (Copy of the Judgment is attached).

That during trial the worthy District Police Officer, Orakzai issued dismissal order of the applicant vide dated 28/12/2020 without fulfilling the codal formalities (Copy attached).

That it is pertinent to mentioned that the charges leveled against the applicant have not been proved, hence the impugned order dated 28/12/2020 is not tenable in the eye of law and the same is liable to be set aside.

That applicant feeling aggrieved from the impugned order dated 28/12/2020 preferred this departmental appeal before your good self.

It is, therefore moist humbly prayed that on acceptance of this department appeal the impugned order dated 28/12/2020 may very kindly be set aside and the applicant be re-instated in to service with all back benefits.

Dated: 26/01/2021

Your Obediently,

MUHAMMAD ZAHIR
(CONSTABLE # 1993)
District Orakzai

ATTESTED

Phone No: 9260112.
Fax No: 9260114.

~~SI~~ ①
E.C. ③⑤

From: - The Regional Police Officer,
Kohat Region, Kohat.

To: - The District Police Officer, Orakzai.

No: 3387 /EC, Dated Kohat the 12/03 /2021.

Subject: - REINSTATEMENT IN SERVICE.

[Signature]
District Police Officer
Orakzai

MEMO:

I am directed to refer to your office Memo: Nos. 406/SRC, dated 10.02.2021 & 410/SRC, dated 10.02.2021 and to state that the appellant mentioned under references have preferred appeals for their reinstatement into service.

After perusal of their appeal, the WRPO Kohat has recorded the following remarks which may be complied:-

"Formal inquiry be initiated."

Encl:
S/Bovls = ③
F/missal + Enquiry file = ②

[Signature]
Office of the DPO, District Orakzai
Diary No 435
Date 15/3/2021

[Signature]
Regional Police Officer,
Kohat Region
12/3

ATTESTED



OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT POLICE OFFICER

ORAKZAI



0925-690257

J (36)

ORDER

As directed by worthy Regional Police Officer Kohat vide letter No. 3387/EC dated 12.03.2021.

Mr. Ali Hassan, SP Investigation is hereby appointed as Enquiry Officer to conduct re-enquiry against the following ex-personnel's of this district police in order to dig out actual facts and to submit his findings within stipulated period.

S. No	Name of Ex-Constables	Section	Remarks
01	Muhammad Zahir s/o Meen Khan	Rabia Khel	Dismissed from service
02	Hashmat Khan s/o Ali Majan	Mishti	-do-

O.B.No 534
Dated 16-3 /2021

Ali Hassan
District Police Officer, Orakzai

No. 861 /EC dated the 16/3 /2021

Copy of above is submitted to Mr. Ali Hassan SP Investigation for compliance.

Enclosed is 02 complete case in the above name.

SP Investigation

~~ATTESTED~~

13

K
37

KOHAT REGION

POLICE DEPTT:

ORDER.

This order will dispose of a departmental appeal moved by Ex-Constable Muhammad Zahir of district Orakzai against the punishment order, passed by DPO Orakzai vide OB No. 1233, dated 28.12.2020 whereby he was awarded major punishment of **dismissal from service** on the allegations of his involvement in criminal case vide FIR No. 335, dated 15.05.2020 u/s 302, 324, 427, 34 PPC PS City, district Hangu.

Comments as well as relevant record were requisitioned from DPO Orakzai and perused. The appellant was also heard in person in O.R held in this office on 16.06.2021. During hearing the appellant did not advance any plausible explanation in his defense to prove his innocence.

Above in view, the undersigned reached to the conclusion that the allegations leveled against the appellant are fully proved. The appellant was not supposed to indulge himself in such like criminal activities which can tarnish the image of Police. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred upon the undersigned under Rules 11-A, his appeal being devoid of merits is **hereby rejected**.

Order Announced
16.06.2021

Mohammad Zafar Ali
(MOHAMMAD ZAFAR ALI) PSP
Region Police Officer,
Kohat Region.

No. 9468 /EC, dated Kohat the 21-6- /2021.

Copy to District Police Officer, Orakzai for information and necessary action w/r to his office Memo: No. 1048/EC, dated 19.04.2021. His 02-Service Roll & Enquiry File is returned herewith.

✓ Books
md

Mohammad Zafar Ali
(MOHAMMAD ZAFAR ALI) PSP
Region Police Officer,
Kohat Region.

APPROVED

قیمت
50 روپے

88703



ایڈویکیٹ:

بار کونسل / ایسوسی ایشن نمبر:

رابطہ نمبر:

پشاور بار ایسوسی ایشن، خیبر پختونخواہ

بعدالت جناب: سروس سٹریٹ ہسٹریل لیسٹ اور

منجانب: محمد طاہر (ایڈیٹور)	دعوی:
	علت نمبر:
	مورخہ:
	جرم:
	تھانہ:

باعت تحریر آتکہ

مقدمہ مندرجہ عنوان بالا میں اپنی طرف سے واسطے پیروی و جواب دہی کاروائی متعلقہ

آن مقام لیسٹ اور ہسٹریل لیسٹ کے اقرار کیا جاتا ہے کہ صاحب موصوف کو مقدمہ کی کل کاروائی کا کامل اختیار ہوگا، نیز ذیل صاحب کو راضی نامہ کر کے واپس لیا جائے گا اور فیصلہ بر حلف دینے جو اب دعویٰ اقبال دعویٰ اور درخواست از ہر قسم کی تصدیق زریں پر دستخط کرنے کا اختیار ہوگا، نیز بصورت عدم پیروی یا ڈگری کی طرف سے یا اپیل کی برآمدگی اور پیروی، نیز دائر کرنے اپیل گزرائی و نظر ثانی و پیروی کرنے کا مختار ہوگا اور بصورت ضرورت مقدمہ مذکورہ کے کل یا جزوی کاروائی کے واسطے اور وکیل یا مختار قانونی کو اپنے ہمراہ یا اپنے بجائے نقرہ کا اختیار ہوگا اور صاحب مقرر شدہ کو وہی جملہ مذکورہ بالا اختیارات حاصل ہوں گے اور ان کا استعمال پر داخلہ منظور و قبول ہوگا دوران مقدمہ میں جو چیز چاہے جانے اتوائے مقدمہ کے سبب سے ہوگا۔ کوئی تاریخ پیشی مقام دورہ یا حد سے باہر ہو تو وکیل صاحب پابند نہ ہوں گے کہ پیروی مذکورہ کریں، لہذا وکالت نامہ لکھ دیا تاکہ سند رہے

Accepted

Attested

کے لیے منظور ہے۔

الرقوم:

العبد

مقام

نوٹ: اس وکالت نامہ کی فوٹوکاپی ناقابل قبول ہوگی۔

Reply

20¹²/₀₂₁

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No. 7034/2021
Muhammad Zahir

..... Appellant

VERSUS

Provincial Police Officer, KP & others

..... Respondents

INDEX

S #	Description of documents	Annexure	pages
1.	Parawise comments	-	01-03
2.	Affidavit	-	04
3.	Copy of FIR No. 335/2020	A	05-06


Deponent

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR

P-0

Service Appeal No. 7034/2021
Muhammad Zahir

..... Appellant

VERSUS



Provincial Police Officer, KP & others

..... Respondents

PARAWISE COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS.

Respectfully Sheweth:-

Preliminary Objections:-

- i. That the appellant has got no cause of action.
- ii. The appellant has got no locus standi to file the appeal.
- iii. That the appellant is estopped to file the instant appeal for his own act.
- iv. That the appeal is bad in eyes of law and not maintainable.
- v. That the appellant has not approached the honorable Tribunal with clean hands.
- vi. That the appeal is bad due to misjoinder & non joinder of necessary parties.

Facts:-

1. The appellant was at the strength of Police and after 25th constitutional amendment the appellant was absorbed in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police vide Govt of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Notification dated 10.02.2020.
2. On 15.09.2020, one Muhammad Adil w/o Wazir Gul lodged FIR No. 335 dated 15.05.2020 u/s 302, 324, 427, 34 PPC, Police station Hangu wherein he charged the appellant alongwith his co-accused for the murder of his father and attempt on his life. Copy of FIR is **annexure A**.
3. Pertains to investigation of case FIR No. mentioned above and trial court, hence no comments.
4. The appellant being member of a disciplined department had committed a heinous offence and violated the rules. Therefore, a regular inquiry was initiated against the appellant under the relevant law / rules.
5. The competent authority i.e respondent No. 3 is empowered to agree or disagree with the finding of inquiry officer, hence the respondent No. 3 being competent authority exercised the lawful powers under law / rules.

6. It is well established principle that criminal and departmental proceedings are different in nature can runs side by side. The respondent No. 3 had not conducted the legal procedure hence on disposal of his 1st departmental appeal by respondent No. 2, the respondent No. 3 was directed to comply with the legal procedure. Hence, the respondent No. 3 complied with the directions accordingly. So far as departmental appeal of the appellant is concerned, it is submitted that the appeal was found devoid of merits by respondent No. 2 and correctly rejected after due process.
7. The appellant is estopped to file the instant appeal for his on act.


Grounds:-


- A. Incorrect, the impugned orders are legal, speaking one and passed in accordance with the relevant law / rules after observing all codal formalities.
- B. The inquiry report of SDPO Upper Orakzai was not found satisfactory by respondent No. 3. Therefore, the respondent No. 3 / competent authority is empowered to agree or disagree with the inquiry report under the relevant law /rules.
- C. Incorrect, in compliance with the directives of respondent No. 2 re-inquiry was initiated by respondent No. 3 and all codal formalities were fulfilled.
- D. Incorrect, the appellant was proceeded with departmentally under the relevant law / rules, therefore, no fundamental right of the appellant was violated.
- E. Reply is submitted in the above paras.
- F. Reply is submitted in the above paras.
- G. The charges / allegations were established against the appellant during the course of departmental inquiry.
- H. Incorrect, complainant Adil has directly charged the appellant with his co-accused for a heinous offence detailed in the enclosed FIR.
- I. Incorrect, as replied above, the appellant and his co-accused have been charged by complainant for the murder of his father and attempted on his life.
- J. Each and every case has its own facts and merits. However, it is submitted that mere acquittal of accused in a criminal case does not amount to his innocence in departmental proceedings as, both are distinct in nature.
- K. Incorrect, as replied above, the appellant was directly charged in FIR for the commission of offence by complainant.
- L. As per record, the respondent No. 3 was satisfied regarding the commission of offence / misconduct, which culminated into his dismissal from service.
- M. Incorrect, the appellant was afforded opportunity of defence during inquiry.
- N. The respondents may also be allowed to advance other grounds during the course of arguments.

Prayer:-

P-3

In view of the above, it is prayed that the appeal contrary to facts, law & rules, devoid of merits and not maintainable may graciously be dismissed with costs.


Regional Police Officer,
Kohat
(Respondent No. 2)
~~Regional Police Officer~~
Kohat Region Kohat


Provincial Police Officer,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
(Respondent No. 1)


District Police Officer,
Orakzai
(Respondent No. 3)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR

P-4

Service Appeal No. 7034/2021
Muhammad Zahir

..... Appellant


VERSUS


Provincial Police Officer, KP & others

..... Respondents


COUNTER AFFIDAVIT


We, the below mentioned respondents, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare on oath that contents of parawise comments are correct and true to the best of our knowledge and belief. Nothing has been concealed from this Hon. Tribunal.


Regional Police Officer,
Kohat
(Respondent No. 2)
Regional Police Officer
Kohat Region Kohat


Provincial Police Officer,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
(Respondent No. 1)


District Police Officer,
Orakzai
(Respondent No. 3)





ابتدائی اطلاعی رپورٹ

Better PLS (A)

ابتدائی اطلاع نسبت جرم قابل دست اندازی پولیس رپورٹ شدہ زبردفعہ 154 مجموعہ ضابطہ فوجداری

ضلع: بہنگو

تھانہ: شی

7

تاریخ و وقت وقوع: 05/01/1987 وقت 12:30 بجے

علت نمبر 33

1	تاریخ و وقت رپورٹ
2	نام و سکونت اطلاع دہندہ و مستغیث
3	مختصر کیفیت جرم (معدفعہ) حال اگر کچھ لیا گیا ہو۔
4	جائے وقوعہ فاصلہ تھانہ سے اور سمت
5	نام و سکونت ملزم
6	کارروائی جو تفتیش کے متعلق کی گئی۔ اگر اطلاع درج کرنے میں توقف ہوا ہو تو وجہ بیان کرو۔
7	تھانہ سے روانگی کی تاریخ و وقت

ابتدائی اطلاع نیچے درج کرو:

جناب عالی: ایک تحریری مراسلہ منجانب محمد رحیم ASHO تھانہ شی بدست مصطفیٰ علی LHC موصول ہو کر درج ذیل ہے۔ بخدمت آفیسر انچارج تھانہ شی بہنگو حسب اطلاع ہسپتال بہنگو ایمر جنسی روم آیا تفتیش ازاں وزیر گل ولد عالم گل بھر 62/63 سال ملاخیل ضلع اور کزنی حال بابونگ بہنگو موجود پا کر بحق مقتول پسران محمد عادل ولد وزیر گل بھر 37/38 سال سکنہ بابونگ شناختی کارڈ نمبر 21604-97102469-0331-0294642 یوں رپورٹ کرتا کہ امر و صبح میں مع والد ام و وزیر گل بھر فرض سودا سلف خریدنے بازار بہنگو آئے تھے۔ بعد سودا سلف خریدنے واپس گھر خود جا رہے تھے۔ اور شاہو آؤ سے رکشہ سہیل کر کے بیٹھ گئے۔ جب مقام جائے بالا وقوعہ پہنچے تو پہلے سے وہاں پر مسیان ایوب ولد گل بت خان سکنہ بابونگ ظاہر ولد عمل خان سکنہ ضلع اور کزنی حال کوہاٹ کالج ٹاؤن مسلح اسلحہ آتشیں موجود تھے۔ ہمیں دیکھتے ہی باارادہ قتل فائرنگ شروع کر دی جن کے فائرنگ سے رکشہ کے اندر والد ام و وزیر گل لگ کر شدید زخمی ہو ا جب کہ میں اور رکشہ ڈرائیور خوش قسمتی سے بچ گئے۔۔ والد ام وزیر گل بر موقع زخموں کی تاب نہ لا کر جان بحق ہوا اور وقوعہ ملزمان موقع سے فرار ہو گئے۔ وجہ عداوت ملزمان کے ساتھ قتل و قاتلہ کی دشمنی چلی آرہی ہے۔ میں والد ام و وزیر گل کے قتل اپنے اور رکشہ ڈرائیور پر فائرنگ کرنے اور رکشہ کی نقصان رسانی کا برخلاف متذکرہ بالا کسان دعویدار ہوں۔ رپورٹ لکھی جا کر غور ہوئے نشان انگوٹھا کارروائی پولیس حسب گفتہ سائل رپورٹ درج بالا ہو کر پڑھ کر درست تسلیم کر کے زیر رپورٹ خود نشان انگوٹھا ثبت کی۔ جس کی میں تصدیق کرتا ہوں۔ مقتول وزیر گل کے کاغذات مرگ تیار کر کے بفرض پوسٹ مارٹم زیر

۲

دو ایڈیٹرز صاحبہ بہترین - دونوں ایڈیٹرز نے بہتر سے بہتر بلاگ لکھی مابقی صاحبہ کو سہ ماہی
 اور نئی بلاگ لکھنے اور نئی سہ ماہی لکھنے چاہیے اور جب اس سال دیا جائے
 اور اگر بلاگ لکھنے کے لیے تیار ہیں تو بلاگ لکھنے کے لیے سہ ماہی لکھنے اور نئی بلاگ لکھنے
 سہ ماہی لکھنے اور نئی سہ ماہی لکھنے چاہیے اور جب اس سال دیا جائے
 اور اگر بلاگ لکھنے کے لیے تیار ہیں تو بلاگ لکھنے کے لیے سہ ماہی لکھنے اور نئی بلاگ لکھنے
 سہ ماہی لکھنے اور نئی سہ ماہی لکھنے چاہیے اور جب اس سال دیا جائے
 اور اگر بلاگ لکھنے کے لیے تیار ہیں تو بلاگ لکھنے کے لیے سہ ماہی لکھنے اور نئی بلاگ لکھنے

شیخہ خالدہ
 M.A.S.I. P.S. City
 15-05-020

دستخط _____

مہر _____

اطلاع کے لیے اطلاع دینا کہ اس کی مہر نشان لگا جائے گا۔ اور اس پر تحریر کنندہ ہندوئی اطلاع کا دستخط اور تصدیق اور کہ حرف الف ب سرخ و زرد نشانی سے القاب نام پر
 ایک لکھنؤ شہر علی المرتبہ واسطے ہاشدگان علاقہ غیر ایسٹ انڈیا بانٹا نشان جہاں ہوزوں ہوں لکھا جائے۔

شیخہ خالدہ

14/01-1582020-9

56-1

حفاظت حوالہ ڈاکٹر صاحب کی مقررہ رپورٹ سے صورت جرم بالا کی پائی جا کر مراسلہ بطور سپیشل رپورٹ اور LHC
بفرض چاکیڈگی پر چار سال قحانہ ہے۔ اور اندراج مقدمہ بفرض تفتیش حوالہ انوسٹی گیشن سٹاف ہوئے انسران بالا صاحبان کو
بذریعہ کنٹرول اطلاع دی جاتی ہے۔ دستخط انگریزی محمد رحیم خان ASHO قحانہ کی مورخہ 15/05/2020 کاروائی
قحانہ بمزاسلہ حرف بہ حرف درج بالا ہو کر پرچہ مجرم چاک دیا جاتا ہے قتل FIR بمعد مزاسلہ بفرض تفتیش حوالہ IBH سٹاف دیا
جاتا ہے۔ پرچہ بطور رپورٹ گزارش ہے۔

شفیع اللہ

MASI. PS. City

15.05.2020

دستخط

عہدہ